DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 806 IR 051 317

TITLE IFLA General Conference, 1985. Division of General Research Libraries. Section on University and Other General Research Libraries. Papers.

INSTITUTION International Federation of Library Associations, The Hague (Netherlands).

PUB DATE Aug 85

NOTE 72p.; Papers presented at the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) General Conference (51st, Chicago, IL, August 18-24, 1985).

PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; *Cataloging; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Information Needs; Interlibrary Loans; International Organizations; *Library Administration; Library Associations; Library Catalogs; Library Cooperation; *Library Standards; Position Papers; *Preservation; Program Descriptions; *Research Libraries

IDENTIFIERS Access to Information; Rare Books; *Resource Sharing

ABSTRACT

Papers on resource sharing, university library standards, and authority control that were presented at the 1985 International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) conference include: (1) "Preservation and Resource-Sharing: Conflicting or Complementary?" (J. F. Govan, United States); (2) "Change in the Catalogue in the Context of Library Management" (G. G. Allen, Australia); (3) "Barriers to the Availability of Research Literature: Conflicts Between Resource Sharing and Preservation in the Federal Republic of Germany" (Gunter Gattermann, West Germany); (4) "Authority Control--A Library Director's View" (M. Runkle, United States); (5) "Standards for University Libraries. Draft Prepared by the Section Working Party" (Beverly P. Lynch, Ed., United States); and (6) "Co-Operation in Mexican University Libraries" (R. Garduno, Mexico). (THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

IFLA

1985

IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE, CHICAGO

Division: General Research Libraries

Section: University and other General Research Libraries

17-UN-2-E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED262806

Preservation and Resource-Sharing: Conflicting or Complementary?

by

J F GOVAN

University Librarian

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

USA

IR051317

KEYWORD(S):

For internal use only: Si

To be brought to meeting no: 120

Remarks:

to be presented orally ☒

for distribution only ☐

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A.L. Van Wesemael

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

Most librarians share the view that the benefits of preserving materials are greatly increased if the material is shared with other libraries. At the same time, they are concerned that this broader use will be harmful to the very materials which they are attempting to preserve. Any helpful discussion of this possible conflict must distinguish among the kinds of material in question, the kinds of preservation used, and the kinds of lending, in each case. Cooperative efforts, both in preservation and in maintaining bibliographic records of preserved titles, can help to keep endangered titles available with less burden on individual libraries. Older technology must sustain preservation for the most part now, but new technologies may well provide the means of sharing materials through the same devices used to preserve them.

Preservation and Resource-Sharing: Conflicting or Complementary?

Recent interest in both the preservation of paper materials and the sharing of intellectual resources understandably has raised questions about the compatibility of these two goals. It is obvious that lending material shortens its life through the physical wear on the material itself, and it seems wasteful to go to the expense and trouble of preserving a document only to destroy it through lending it to other libraries. On the other hand, it seems equally obvious that materials worth preserving lose much of their value to scholarship if they are not shared. At first glance, librarians appear to be facing a paralyzing dilema.

Let me begin by pointing out something that all of you know already: resource sharing is one of the least, if not the least, threats to your collections. The major threats are the paper on which they are printed and the environment in which they exist on your shelves. A book published today has 300 years less life expectancy than a book published in the 16th century. Consequently, it is estimated that roughly a fourth to a third collections in American research libraries now are in a precarious state. It is difficult to generalize about all sizes and types of libraries, but it is, I think, safe to say that every library collection in the world has a segment that is in poor condition. It is even safer to say that the one most important prevention of further deterioration is the proper climatic conditions: a temperature of from 65 to 75 degrees Fahrenheit and a level of humidity between 45 and 55 per cent.

Part of the difficulty in discussing preservation is that librarians have not been precise in their use of terms, and their discussions have been sadly lacking in definitions. Almost as many types of preservation as types of material exist. Binding and mending, adding duplicate copies or reprints, microfilming or photocopying on acid free paper, and any one of a variety of new technological solutions, all fall within the definition of preservation. An even greater variety of techniques become involved with sound recordings, graphics, magnetic tapes, and video tapes, forms which will come to store more and more scholarly and scientific information as time passes.

For our purposes, perhaps it is best that we confine ourselves to discussing collections of printed texts. Even within that single, if broad, class of material, we should be discussing specific solutions to each problem of deterioration. One distinction is fundamental to the classification of materials with problems: those documents which must be preserved in their original form and those which require only that their intellectual content be preserved. The first group, a large body of material, must have what is more accurately called conservation: the restoration of the physical original. For the most part, these materials are manuscripts and rare books, which seldom are lent and are never lent if they are in a fragile condition. In short, while items that must be preserved in their original form are vitally important to some scholars, they need not enter into our discussion of sharing resources which have been preserved.

The materials preserved for their intellectual content also span a broad variety of types. Journals and newspapers, because of their bulk and, often, their brittleness, normally require photocopying or microfilming, both forms of preservation, before a library will lend them. Books published after the middle of the last century, when publishers introduced paper made from wood pulp on a large scale, require similar treatment. These two groups of material, largely because of their brittle pages, create the bulk of the problem arising from a possible conflict between preservation and resource-sharing. But the established methods of preservation, chiefly microfilming, create a reproduction, which, in turn, can produce lending copies and thus should resolve most conflicts between these two efforts.

While microfilming is currently the prevailing method of preservation, it has a number of drawbacks. It is not always suitable for bound volumes --mostly those that have been rebound, so that the print extends into the gutters. These volumes simply will not flatten to a point at which the camera can get a clear picture, and the technician has the choice of cutting the binding (and thus destroying the volume) or doing nothing. In all instances, it is expensive, because it requires large amounts of time from highly trained personnel. In addition, it requires expensive equipment in space that has been adapted to this special purpose. In view of these difficulties with microfilm, all of us should be urging publishers constantly to use acid-free papers in their products.

Microfilming, however, does have some benefits. Most research libraries with which I am familiar follow the same practices that we

follow at North Carolina, *i. e.*, we film the original and retain the negative while selling the positive to the interested library. The negative on file then becomes the source for all subsequent copies requested, so that the original never has to be handled again. You will notice that I said "sell" the positive, because so far as I am aware, all libraries require compensation for the filming. The library to which the film is sent, on the other hand, can retain its copy of the film and add it permanently to the collection, a practice which carries resource-sharing to its ultimate level.

Please indulge me in a small digresssion. This growing practice of sharing materials in microform and, indeed, of adding to collections increasingly by the purchase of microforms raises, I think, two fundamental questions. It is clear that libraries are going to become progressively more dependent on resources in microform, and it seems to me that librarians should become more sensitive to the state of the art of microforms. Any librarian servicing a large microform collection is familiar with patrons' complaints about the discomfort and fatigue that using these materials produces. This unfortunate—and perhaps unnecessary—condition has been true since the 1930's, and it persists today when near miracles are occurring in the optical field. When one considers the vast improvements in motion pictures and television, one wonders why library patrons are still required to tolerate such poor equipment for reading microforms. I think librarians must continue to make the manufacturers aware of the growing importance of these materials in their collections and insist on improvements in the

readers that are offered for sale.

In view of the large amount of microfilm which we are likely to have with us for the foreseeable future, I would urge you to exert this presure on manufacturers regardless of the technological advances which may make microforms less prominent ultimately. Such advances are clearly on the way. All of us are aware of the rapid improvements in photoduplication by machines which now have designs specifically adopted to reduce the damage to book bindings. These machines, when using acid-free paper, offer new opportunities for resource sharing without damage to originals and, indeed, for the local replacement of fragile books with hard copy reproductions.

While we are alerting the manufacturers, we ourselves must become aware of the increasing prominence of microforms in our collections. They have tended to be the orphans in libraries. They seldom receive full cataloging, and, partly as a result of that neglect, they clearly get less use than their content warrants. In the last two or three years in this country, the Association of Research Libraries has led a national cooperative effort to expand the bibliographic records of microforms, and I would urge others to take up this cause internationally. If access to these materials continues to be less than it is to other materials, much of our effort in both preservation and resource sharing will be unproductive.

Books with brittle pages, whatever the condition of their bindings, will require replacement in one form or another for local as well as

lending use. A smaller problem in the total challenge of preserving collections is the bound material which has no brittle pages but damaged and vulnerable bindings. Here, the conflict between resource-sharing and preservation is obvious. Repaired or mended volumes are clearly at risk when they must travel some distance to a borrowing library, and lending them requires constant care. The staff should have clear guidelines governing packaging for sending and returning, modes of transportation, and, where possible, insurance. Fortunately, this group is probably the smallest among materials borrowed and lent, so that adequate protection should be possible.

In sum, the variety of methods of preservation, the use of reproduced or duplicate copies, the limited portion of collections which will have fragile bindings as opposed to brittle pages, and carefully drawn policies and procedures governing interlibrary loans should protect most collections adequately against damage through resource-sharing. As a last resort, a library can refuse to lend a given physical item on the grounds of its condition. But one should not exercise that option lightly, because sharing resources, like preservation, is a vital contribution to the world of learning, which is the world that each of us serves. It is an act of generosity which, like most, has its own rewards, in prompting us to preserve our collections' most vulnerable materials and in providing access to other libraries' resources.

This principle of mutual benefit lies at the base of the long and productive tradition of interlibrary cooperation. One of the earliest forms of that cooperation was interlibrary lending under commonly accepted

regulations, which often provided more protection to materials than local use did. In the United States, the American Library Association led this movement and established the rules for interlibrary loans. Later, libraries formed regional, State, and local organizations for resource-sharing. The governing agreements permitted a wider distribution of the burden of lending and opened the opportunity for a library with a vulnerable copy of a requested title to refer the borrowing library to a collection with a sound copy of the title. Thus, lending consortia were in themselves an element in the preservation of collections.

It is perhaps only natural that now cooperative efforts aimed specifically at preservation are becoming more common. More and more regional centers are coming into existence in this country, and more are on the way, such as the Council on Library Resources' recently proposed Mid-Atlantic Center. It is significant, I think, that national organizations like the Council and the National Endowment for the Humanities are supporting this effort, recognizing, on the one hand, that the task ahead is too large for a single national center and, on the other, the clear advantages of interlibrary cooperation on preservation. The establishement of a center, which can be located in a currently operated library, enables each member library to share the costs of a special facility, of expensive equipment, and of a trained staff, with the others belonging to that center.

No single library can or should preserve everything in need of attention, and a cooperative effort allows the responsibility for preserving to be divided. Whether the division is regional or national,

by type of library, by subject matter or by chronological age, it can vastly reduce the burden on each library. But such a division of a labor makes the sharing of records of preserved copies essential, so that each library will know where the surviving copy or copies of a title reside. In this country, OCLS, RLIN, and ASL, are supporting efforts to have on public record the title of every preserved copy. Fortunately, this same kind of record is possible in manual systems, so that cooperative efforts of this nature need not wait on the installation of online systems.

I have tried to stress the value of cooperation in both preservation and resource-sharing and to demonstrate the need for leadership from the national associations. Fortunately, some of our national libraries are already leading the movement for preservation. The British Library has developed a book scanner, now commercially available, that will convert printed material into machine-readable form for preservation or transmission. The reports on it indicate that the conversion is rapid and inflicts no damage on the document. Furthermore, the material, once in digital form, can be re-copied countless times without any deterioration of the image.

The Library of Congress is now conducting a pilot program which uses a scanner to transfer images to disks. It has two projects: one transferring printing to digital disks and one transferring graphic images to videodisks. After processing, the material transferred will be immediately accessible on high resolution terminals in the Library. Later, transmission of the images to more remote sites will be possible.

Under the three year pilot program, the Library is concentrating on periodicals, manuscripts, microforms, maps,and sheet music in the print project and on photoprints and photonegatives, slides, and motion pictures, in the image project. Simultaneously, the Library is mounting a major de-acidifacation program for printed books, and the hope is that the technology refined in all three of these major programs will be beneficial to a broader world of libraries and archives.

Presumably, other projects of a similar nature are going on elsewhere. It is gratifying that the national libraries are experimenting with these processes, because these devices at this point are far too expensive for most individual libraries to purchase. In time, these capabilities should be far more widespread, if only on the regionally cooperative basis mentioned earlier. One of the great virtues of all of them is that for the first time technologically they join in a happy marriage effort for both preservation and resource sharing. These systems provide, essentially in the single step of converting print to digital form, the preserved copy and the text for transmission to other libraries. Thus, in future libraries, there can be no perceived conflict between preservation and resource-sharing, for to do one is to provide for doing the other.

The problems surrounding this issue are, it turns out, more human than technological. They lie not only in the concerns that prompted this program but in restrictions imposed by copyright, a intricate subject that we cannot explore today. Clearly, the most severe problem is library management's general neglect of preservation. This neglect has led

national organizations in this country to give the problem a much higher priority and much greater prominence than they had previously. We are rapidly approaching that point in many libraries—particularly those without adequate environmental control—at which we cannot delay action further. We are already losing irreplaceable materials, and any more delay will add rapidly to that loss, because the crucial ,materials are reaching the age at which disintegration will accelerate. This neglect far exceeds resource-sharing as a threat to the survival of collections.

Of course, the reluctance to attack the problems is largely understandable. Its magnitude is extremely daunting, the cost will be high, and the technology which has been available has not seemed equal to the task. Both cooperative approaches to the problem and technological improvements have been encouraging and, combined with the growing awareness of the disaster which inactivity is bringing, have led librarians to believe that some significant preventive measures can be taken. Under the best of cirmumstances, it will not be easy or inexpensive. But librarians, as the chief stewards of cultural heritages and the prime advocates of the spread of learning, should not , and indeed, cannot be deterred by that.

As we approach the problem, we should remember some of the points that I have tried to make today. We should remember that local needs for preservation and the requirements of resource-sharing are much the same and that conflict between the two should arise only in a limited area and, perhaps, for a limited time. We should remember that cooperative efforts spread the burdens and the costs of both of these essential activities in

libraries today. We should keep these issues before our national associations and national libraries, for their leadership is indispensable. And, finally, we should carry that last effort one step further and attempt to guide IFLA into a leadership role in this same important area.

IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE, CHICAGO

Division: General Research Libraries

Section: Cataloguing. University and other General Research Libraries

1985

76 UN-4 / CAT-1 E

Change in the Catalogue in the context of library management

by

G G ALLEN

Principal Librarian

Western Australian Institute of Technology

Australia

KEYWORD(S):

For internal use only:

To be brought to meeting no: 170

Remarks:

to be presented orally ☒

for distribution only ☐

CHANGE IN THE CATALOGUE IN THE CONTEXT OF LIBRARY MANAGEMENT

G. G. Allen
Principal Librarian
Western Australian Institute of Technology

*****

This paper discusses the impact of automation and centralised cataloguing on the practices of cataloguers in individual libraries. Concern is expressed at the continuing high level of change in codes, schedules and formats and the cost to libraries of monitoring and implementation. Attention is drawn to the failure to heed earlier calls for a fundamental examination of the principles and objectives of cataloguing or to consider the cost/benefit equation for library operations. It is postulated that library managements should assume a controlling role in the development and modification of cataloguing practice against a background of studies of user needs.

CHANGE IN THE CATALOGUE IN THE CONTEXT OF LIBRARY MANAGEMENT

G.G. Allen
Principal Librarian, Western Australian
Institute of Technology

Despite the considerable advances that have been achieved through automation, the cataloguing process continues to claim a large share of any library's resources. Indeed it is arguable that the often promised economies to flow from automation may not have eventuated at all, such savings as may have been achieved through reductions of cataloguing staff having been offset by the costs of purchasing, maintaining and all too soon replacing equipment, hiring computing experts, and paying for the machine readable records produced by a central agency. Unfortunately few libraries appear to have studied, or published, their detailed costs of cataloguing before and after automation.

Although there were expressions of concern over cataloguing costs around the time that computers were being recognised as having a real potential value for libraries - "we want somehow to cut cataloguing costs" (Grose & Line 1969), - the pressures on library budgets have become much more severe in recent years. Whereas their concern led Grose and Line to ask a number of perceptive questions about the nature and purpose of catalogues, and to recognise that

> "mechanization, with its opportunities for doing things which have been impossible before - at a price, provides an opportunity for a break with the past"

they also warned librarians not

> "to jump on the bandwagon of mechanization without the least idea of where it is going."

Whether or not that warning was ever heard by most librarians is no longer relevant as we are now so deeply enmeshed in automated processing that even the thought of withdrawal produces almost unthinkable symptoms. However, it must now be clear to anyone willing to examine our present situation that the computer has not proved to be the universal library panacea, and indeed that it is creating a

whole new plethora of problems to extend or replace those we had hoped it would remove.

It is interesting to compare two statements about cataloguing activities written twenty-six years apart, before and after the automation revolution. In 1955 Wagman wrote:

> "If we recatalogue the publications of corporate bodies to bring them under the latest form of name, we do so on the assumption that in the long run this renders a service to the library user and the library staff that outweighs the cost. This is a dubious thesis at least, and the administrator cannot and should not accept it without supporting evidence."

This is surely a very reasonable attitude for a library administrator, but we may suspect that the "supporting evidence" will have been a theoretical discussion of cataloguing principles, rather than an experimental demonstration of the benefit to users. There is however a change of pace in the statement by White in 1981 that:

> "As libraries face the realities of inadequate funding ... questions about the level and extent of the bibliographic analysis and costs incurred or saved in accepting lower levels of detail become factors in overall library strategy. They are not just decisions for experts in technical processing."

Far from relieving the library administrator of his budgetary worries over high or rising cataloguing costs, the introduction of automation and the establishment of centralised, cooperative or shared cataloguing agencies, has forced cataloguing into the very centre of the "library strategy". These primrose paths have very quickly turned out to be one way routes with regular toll gates and their own boards of managers and directors to ensure that we keep moving and meet our commitments.

It is undeniable that automation has changed the processes of cataloguing and the appearance of catalogues, and there is reasonable evidence that some of the changes have been beneficial. Microfiche and on-line catalogues appear not only to be accepted by users, but widely to be preferred to the card catalogues they are replacing. There should however be greater concern that the concepts, and the attitudes of cataloguers, that drive the process have changed little,

and that the application of automation is in fact entrenching these concepts and attitudes even more deeply in our library economies.

There should be more evident concern that the application of automation to cataloguing has essentially ossified thinking about the function and structure of catalogues, and at a time when thinking about these issues was undergoing considerable change. As Bryant (1980) has written:

> "It is a paradox that at a time when the technical ability exists to store and flexibly manipulate data on a scale previously unimagined the result has been the development of formats and standards based in the main on the conventional catalogue record."

Moreover the failure of, primarily British and American, experts to resolve their differences of theory or practice has unnecessarily confused our bibliographic databases and complicated our computerised processing systems. This failure is implicitly castigated by Richmond (1976) in discussing a 1972 dissertation by Ann Fox whence she derived evidence that the difference, in practice, between the ALA and AACR rules was not enough:

> "To justify the effort that went into making the last revision".

It is the continuance of situations comparable with these that makes

> "Some librarians feel it is difficult to conform in the way that they are told, and feel they should, (Bryant 1980)

and may explain why Svenonius (1980) can complain that

> "Many libraries still today alter every bibliographical record they receive from an outside source. At what cost? Are there user studies to justify custom tailoring?"

Any historical examination of cataloguing practice and catalogues must persuade us that change has been the one common factor. There is probably no large catalogue that has grown over many years that has retained internal consistency, while cataloguing codes, filing rules, and classifications, all exhibit periodic if not continuous change. Some of this change is a response to genuine changes in need, such as an emergence of an entirely new field of knowledge that requires to be expressed in a classification scheme. Other changes are more the result of changes in professional fashions, or a shift in the balance of consensus among those in a position to express their innovative views in a new or revised version. Before automation and centralised

catalogue sources these changes could be adopted or ignored by individual libraries, or could be implemented as or when practical. But with the widespread and growing use of machine readable records derived from centralised cataloguing agencies the changes are implemented at source, at a time and in a manner to suit the agency, and the local cataloguers and library administrators are left to deal with the consequences as best they can.

The idealised vision of the MARC format as a means to communicate widely acceptable cataloguing data from which libraries might select and reorganise the sub-set appropriate to their local needs has already been proved to be a grand illusion. Equally the euphoria over the apparent congruance of British and American opinions on descriptive cataloguing that occurred, albeit briefly, after AACR1, was effectively dispelled with the arrival of AACR2, at which time Bryant (1980) wrote that:

> "...if past experience is a reliable indicator of future prospects [for AACR2] modifications will multiply rapidly ... The prospect of AACR3 was clearly visible three years before the implementation date for AACR2."

How true this prediction has been proved already. Annual revisions to AACR2 have appeared, that for 1983 containing 90 separate variant decisions, some admittedly trivial but others of considerable substance (ANGLO-AMERICAN...1984).

But the consequences of AACR2 and the activities of the Joint Steering Committee for its revision, do not end with the publication of the annual revisions. Despite all the expert debate which has produced AACR2 itself and now produces the revisions, but partly because of the permissive character of this code, there follows inevitably an extensive and drawn out process of "interpretation". Thus the Library of Congress Processing Division finds it necessary to publish extensive lists of rule interpretations, (the Summer 1984 list in Cataloging Service Bulletin No. 25, which also includes Joint Steering Committee official changes to AACR2, contains seventy pages), and then cannot always offer a definitive decision. The phrase "This decision is tenative; the Library of Congress has not yet made a final decision" appears quite frequently and contains the threat of yet another change at some future date when the Library of Congress eventually makes up its corporate mind.

Again, practising librarians had learned to live with the problem of imperfect classification schemes and often dramatic changes in the schedules between editions. Now the class number comes with the descriptive data, and though it is good to know that the Dewey Classification Editorial Policy Committee:

> "...recognized that phoenix revisions which reuse numbers without regard to their former meaning, cause extensive problems for *classifiers* [my italics] who must fully implement the new schedule and thus reclassify old material to maintain collocation; or reject the phoenix schedule and thus perpetuate an increasingly obsolete and difficult arrangement; or maintain the old arrangement and implement the phoenix for new material only, and thus negate the collocation to the detriment of browsers" (Cockshutt 1983),

the problem for the local classifier, and for the manager, is now worse than ever. Now the new class numbers appear in machine readable records at a time and with a certainty beyond the control of the user libraries, forcing either the first or last of the above alternatives, or additional effort to be expended to detect each case of a new number and then to reclassify the title back to the superseded number. If that is not bad enough, it has since been announced* that "a policy of continuous revision of the Dewey Decimal Classification has been adopted." While this last is claimed to be a response to demands from user libraries, the consequence for users of centralised MARC data may be an increase in uncertainty about the status of DC class numbers in those records, despite the inclusion of DC edition information, and therefore a need for increased vigilance if any cohesive policy on shelf classification is to be maintained in the working library.

The tinkering that goes on with the Dewey Classification between editions is, from a library managerial point of view, if anything worse than revisions to AACR, although perhaps the Joint Steering Committee will do better in time! The roughly-annual DC& (Dewey Decimal Classification Additions, Notes and Decisions), reports

---

*DC& Vol. 4. no. 4, Winter 1983/84, p.11.

literally hundreds of variations to the current edition. The 1983 issue (Vol. 4 no. 3) listed 300 detailed instructions in 20 pages of corrections, changes and new numbers, and in 1984 (vol. 4 no. 4) there were another 19 pages of the same kind of updates.

Lastly, but far from least, the automated cataloguer and the long suffering library manager must cope with Library of Congress Subject Headings. Since the 9th edition of these, published in 1979, there have been quarterly cumulative and annual supplements devoted to the announcement of cancellations, changes or additional headings. The 1982 annual supplement, not actually published until 1984, contains 474 large pages of these variations, many of them it is pointed out due to the impact of AACR2!

Whether or not these myriad and on-going changes to the detail of cataloguing and classification are evident in the catalogues that our readers finally attempt to use, they are a fact of life for the cataloguer, and they generate a continuing and significant operational cost that the library administrator must meet. Moreover they must surely demonstrate that cataloguing today is no more a science than it ever was. If cataloguers cannot reach a more stable consensus than the present condition of international cataloguing exhibits, then perhaps it is time that others assumed the responsibility. The problem has clearly not been relieved by automation and may even have been exacerbated by it.

Writing in 1971 Bryant and Line argued that brevity in the catalogue record, if not demonstrably a hindrance to readers, was to be desired, for among other reasons that

> "with machine records anything that reduces the file size is to be welcomed." (Bryant and Line 1971).

This concern for file, and record, size in machine systems was entirely valid in 1971. However in 1985 the vastly greater power of our computers. the cunning of our programmers, and the real reduction in cost of storage devices. has largely negated that early concern. The on-line catalogue is a reality, as is the full-text database. Is the answer to any doubts or ambiguity in cataloguing therefore now resolvable through a practice of "putting everything in?"

It may however be unwise to answer such questions now on a purely pragmatic basis, as it has continually been shown to have been unwise to have resolved questions about cataloguing practices in the past through apparently simple and piecemeal adjustments to the rules. Again I would echo the warnings of Line and his co-workers of the early seventies, and suggest that the:

> "total and fundamental questioning of all cataloguing principles and practice" (Grose and Line 1969)

that they regarded as urgent then, has still not been carried through, and is still required. Some advances have of course been made, for instance the convincing evidence of Seal, Bryant and Hall (1982) that short entry catalogues have some positive advantages for users.

There is a very considerable danger today that cataloguing, like many other human activities, is being technology driven. It may be that cataloguers go 'whither they know not, nor do they care', but surely someone should know and should care if the direction and the journey are useful and necessary or not. Even though much is now possible that could not even be imagined twenty years ago, and even though the costs of the technology are being reduced, there is still a cost, and there will be future costs for maintenance, adjustments to yet newer technologies, and revisions of practices etc.

It should be axiomatic, if not actually self-evident, that

> "the [library] administrator has no special interest or bias but is concerned with the welfare of the library as a whole" (Wagman 1955),

and therefore that administering librarians must concern themselves with both the economies of cataloguing and with the relevance of catalogues to the needs of users. Equally

> "practical cataloguers who produce working catalogues must accept their managerial responsibilities ... It is time now to conserve the undoubted advances that have been achieved, to eliminate the unnecessary and uneconomic deviations that have arisen, and to identify directions along which change is both desirable and possible." (Allen 1984).

The urgency apparent to Grose and Line in 1969, that did find an outlet in the studies that have been carried out at Bath University,

has still not been allayed by any perceptible changes in the attitudes and practices of the major agencies controlling codes and managing the sources of catalogue data. It is clearly not enough for library administrators to express concern, or to make isolated and unilateral gestures of defiance against some ill-advised adjustment to cataloguing practices. The urgency now is to devise mechanisms whereby those who have to meet the costs can exert some control over the extent, directions and timing of all future changes and revisions to cataloguing practices, and thereby give substance to the ideal expressed by Elaine Svenonius (1980), that

> "whenever a new cataloguing code is being designed each projected change should be viewed in terms of its impact, that is, in terms of the cost of implementing it and the benefits that might be expected to accrue from it."

In that, as she continues,

> "Cost/benefit analyses ... must be based on a strong conceptual foundation: [and] the establishment of such a foundation involves the asking of fundamental questions ..."

work on user needs for, and activity at the catalogue must be continued and intensified, and must involve those other librarians who actually work with library users, and are indeed also themselves users of the catalogue.

References

ALLEN, Geoffrey (1984). Responsibility and the managerial challenge for cataloguing in the computer age. AUSTRALIAN COLLEGE LIBRARIES, 2(4): 145-150.

ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGUING RULES, Second Edition. Revisions 1983. (1984). Chicago, American Library Association.

BRYANT, Philip (1980). Progress in documentation. The catalogue. JOURNAL OF DOCUMENTATION, 36(2): 133-163.

BRYANT, Philip and LINE, Maurice (1971). Cataloguing and classification at Bath University Library : on the track of white elephants and golden retrievers. LIBRARY ASSOCIATION RECORD 73(12): 225-227

COCKSHUTT, Margaret E (1983). Annual report of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee, July 1, 1981-June 30,1982. DC& 4(3):6-9.

GROSE, M.W. & LINE, M.B. (1969). On the construction and care of white elephants. Some fundamental questions concerning the catalogue. LIBRARY ASSOCIATION RECORD 70(1): 2-5.

RICHMOND, Phyllis A. (1976). Research possibilities in the machine-readable catalogue: use of the catalogue to study itself. JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANSHIP, 2(5): 224-229.

SEAL, Alan, BRYANT, Philip and HALL, Carolyn (1982). FULL AND SHORT ENTRY CATALOGUES. Library needs and uses. Aldershot, Gower Publishing Co. Ltd.

SVENONIUS, Elaine (1980). Directions for research in indexing, classification and cataloguing. LIBRARY RESOURCES AND TECHNICAL SERVICES 25: 88-103.

WAGMAN, Frederick H. (1955). The Administrator and the research library catalog. JOURNAL OF CATALOGUING AND CLASSIFICATION, 11(4):190-196.

WHITE, Herbert S. (1981). We do,do,do,and don't know why. Cataloguing practices cry out for re-exaination. AMERICAN LIBRARIES, 12(6): 317-318.

IFLA 1985

Division: General Research Libraries

Section: University Libraries and other General Research Libraries

82-UN-5-E

Barriers to the availability of research literature: Conflicts between resource sharing and preservation in the Federal Republic of Germany

by

Günter Gattermann
Leitender Bibliotheksdirektor
Universitätsbibliothek Dusseldorf
Bundesrepublik Deutschland

KEYWORD(S):

Interlending
Resource sharing
Preservation
Rare and precious books

For internal use only:

To be brought to meeting no:
136

Remarks:

to be presented orally [X]
for distribution only [ ]

1. German interlibrary lending as a means of free availability of literature

The number of publications in nearly all fields of research is obviously increasing, while at the same time the purchasing power of university libraries has come to a standstill or is decreasing. Consequently, the individual university library seeing its acquisitions constantly reduced to smaller parts of the whole amount of literature necessary is less and less capable of satisfying the information needs of research. The discrepancy between decreasing offer and increasing demand is daily growing and forces the libraries into cooperation: Cooperative purchase programmes, shared specialization of the collections, complete bibliographic recording and the establishment of an efficient interlibrary lending system should provide the academic user with free access to the scientific information needed. (1)

In the Federal Republic of Germany, the principle of resource sharing has for a long time already played an important part in the network of the so-called "Supraregional Provision of Library Material for Science and Research". The German interlibrary lending system which was developed in 1890 tries to compensate the missing of a big central and universal library by means of a cooperative system of give and take. The importance of the German interlibrary lending even increased after the Second World War for many reasons: A lot of libraries had lost their collections through war, the system of decentralized shared specialization of collections was extended, for a start, many new foundations of universitites depended very strongly on the resources of the older university libraries, and finally, the municipal public libraries had to be included among the participating libraries.

The "Bibliotheksplan 1973. Entwurf eines umfassenden Bibliotheksnetzes für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland" is the result of a process of cultural democratization to be observed

in the 1960's and early 1970's that aimed at providing still wider parts of the population with literature. It states that: "To be able to cope with the constantly growing requirements in all fields of general knowledge, professional formation and training, research and academic education, literature of all kind that will be the basic fundament of learning in future and all means of information must be available for anybody at any place." (2)

Obviously, this is a national programme of the universal availability of publications that could hardly be expressed in a more complete or more ideal way.

The concept of a supraregional network of resource sharing is taken up in the "Leihverkehrsordnung der deutschen Bibliotheken 1979" (directives for interlibrary lending) that together with its precursors of 1930, 1951, and 1966 continues to promote a wide distribution of the national book collections:
"§ 1,3: The supraregional interlibrary lending supports research and academic education. Further on, it provides with academic literature for education, continued studies, professional training and daily duties." (3)

The availability of interlending services, not only for research purposes and not only for research libraries, has the effect that in practise each library can use the other as lending institution in order to fill gaps in its own collection. The originally subsidiary function of this part of library cooperation has developed into a fundamental function concerning the supraregional availability of literature.

Thus, the effectivness of the supraregional system of literature provision depends strongly on the efficiency of interlending. The achievements of the participating libraries are remarkable: 1983 more than 2 Mio interlending orders were given and worked on, half of them could be satisfied through

photocopies. Some bigger libraries were particularly involved: the university library of Frankfurt dealt with more than 122.000 orders, Göttingen with over 191.000, and the university library and special library for technical information Hannover with more than 337.000 in 1983. (4)

In this context, I cannot enter into the general problems of the German interlibrary lending system, but only mention a few important facts: Using the interlending service generally does not cost the reader anything, libraries do not balance their individual expenses for postage and packing, books are sent in the original, periodical literature up to 20 pages is copied and sent without charges for the user, certain parts of the collections are excluded from interlending, limiting agreements exist.

In his highly discussed book "Buch, Bibliothek und geisteswissenschaftliche Forschung", Bernhard Fabian, German professor of English literature, describes the deficiencies of the German interlibrary lending system, wants it free of dogmatism, and proposes several improvements to reduce obvious misuse, because gradually the unlimited utilization of the system starts to have bad effects on research, particularly in the humanities. Of course, a ramified interlending service seems necessary in a decentralized system, the nearly unlimited accessibility for everybody, however, often results in obstacles for research: The strain on the system causes longer delays, a growing number of unfulfilled orders, increasing costs, more and more conflicts between local interests and interlending, and copyright conflicts, because of the photocopies. Interlending has become very complex and difficult to handle in my country. (5)

Fabian stresses that it is wrong when until today a cleverly contrived library policy pretends to administer a surplus that is easily available for everybody instead of admitting that only shortage is administered. Interlibrary lending prin-

cipally is no means of literature supply for the humanities, and therefore all attempts of improving practicability and organisation are not of much use - at least to the humanities - unless the "philosophy" of the whole system is changed.

2. Damage to the collections through resource sharing

Fabian's provocative book started a vehement and partly controversial discussion I can't consider in detail in this context. I should like however, to recommend it to all those planning to extend resource sharing in their countries: Interlending as an important means of the free availability of literature can impede the very availability in certain circumstances. Availability turns over to unavailability. Here, only a single aspect of resource sharing can be examined that Fabian also deals with: the problem of damage to the collections and of possible counteractions, i.e. preservation.

Several attentive observers report on serious changes in the behaviour of users towards valuable old books:
"As a result of the enormous increase in book production, particularly however of the advancing of nondurable and throw-away-books, books have definitely lost the character of something special and preservable in general consciousness. Out of ignorance, an unabashed attitude is shown towards all kinds of books including specially the older forms. It is a question of alienation from the cultural influence 'book', lasting for centuries, that is possibly typical of a social atmosphere moulded by new media ... The naive reader without sufficient knowledge of the scientific and cultural value of library collections is accompanied by the demanding-aggressive patron to whom a book means nothing but material to dispose of to his advantage, and who would like to abolish library rules on the whole as superfluous bureaucracy.

Occasionally, this attitude is supported by the noisy reference to a pretended basic right on unlimited access to all parts of collections in public possession." (6)

The careless, often even inconsiderate attitude towards books and periodicals, and the excessive constant use of parts of the collections (for instance Baroque literature) in connection with great academic projects resulted in an extent of deterioration not known to be possible in such a short time up to then. The unrestrained direct copying on paper by the reader himself constantly causes serious damage to books and periodicals. Some observers even speak of ruin. I don't need to describe the deterioration in detail. (7)

The damage to be observed in local use is increased by interlending: Already the physical transport of literature from place to place by means of delivery cars or post (more than 1 Mio units per annum are packed and sent) do books and periodicals harm. Here, particularly the great amount of older and valuable books is in danger, because in the interlending and dispatch offices organized for routine and mass treatment they are handled in the same way as normal textbooks. Often, the staff ist not sufficiently trained or strained in a way that a distinction between differently qualified users and differently valuable items is no longer possible. Frequently, it is not realized that books are objects of cultural value that should be preserved.

In our country, nobody thinks of borrowing precious pictures from the museums to write a dissertation. With regard to many of our books more valuable than pictures, this is unscrupulously requested and, unfortunately, granted. Obviously, the restrictive rules of the interlending directives do not offer a sufficient basis for the preservation and protection of the collections.

With regard to medieval manuscripts, autographs and incunabula, limiting special rules of the interlending directives and conscientiousness of the librarians in charge succeeded in the meantime in convincing the user that it might be better if he went to the book instead of expecting the book to come to him, and that in most cases a microfilm is sufficient for research. (8)

However it seems to be very difficult to judge books of the 15th to the 20th century concerning the importance of contents, rarity or value - no matter the reasons -, and they are still frequently requested in interlending and generously sent. Here, in many cases, it would be necessary to examine each item to decide whether it may be lent, under what conditions, and to whom. Besides, the user would have to be convinced to understand this distinction. Such a renewed individual treatment would be important, but cannot be realized by most of the university libraries because of the mass treatment already described.

A statistic inquiry showed that in 1979 about 4,5% of all German interlending orders concerned literature published before 1801, about 11,5% literature published between 1801 and 1899, i.e. more than 16% (about 120.000 orders) concerned literature published before 1900. (9) Faced with these quantities, who should be able to take constant notice whether the borrowing library has adequate equipment and qualified staff; who could always make sure that books for use in the reading rooms of the library only are not given out to the patron's institute or home; who should care for copying regulations being observed?

Who can know whether members of the staff of the borrowing library don't perhaps feel obliged towards a certain user and interpret the lending rules liberally, whereas the user's identity is kept unknown to the lending library by means of a user's number?

Who among the responsible staff of the lending and borrowing libraries has got enough time and is willing to examine the books sent back with regard to possible harm and, if necessary to claim damages?

3. Plans and measures to reduce the conflict between use and preservation of the collections

It can't be denied that out of a (renewed) growing responsibility for preservation, many university libraries don't any longer deal with interlending in the same generous way and tend to introduce restrictions. These single measures comprise keeping certain parts of the collections as reference material (for example periodicals), the establishment of reserve-collections of rare and precious books up to a general lending prohibition of literature published between 1500 and 1850, measures that are contrary to the principle of the universal availability of all national resources of scientific literature (UAP). (10) These single steps of different libraries, however, in our relatively small country, can easily induce the user to critical comparisons of the various procedures and cause considerable conflicts.

Although up to now neither librarians nor readers seem to be very conscious of the need and urgency of preservation, solutions on a national level are increasingly discussed in the Federal Republic of Germany, and new ideas from Great Britain and the United States of America are appreciated. (11;12)

For instance it is suggested
- to establish national archival libraries, where the important research literature is to be kept on hand,
- to reserve valuable historic collections and exclude them from interlending,
- to work on central bibliographic records by retrospective

conversion of catalogue data of historic collections by means of automatic data processing,

- to improve the restoration of the collections in danger,
- to fulfil all interlending orders on literature published before 1900 only by means of microfiches,
- to introduce other new technologies for storage and transmission of texts that make it possible to separate information in contents and physical carriers in order to spare the originals.

In autumn 1984, the "Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft" set up a task force consisting of five directors of big research libraries in order to discuss Fabian's important topics and theses and to work on further suggestions concerning among others better recording and preservation of historic collections and the use of microfiches and microfilms in interlending. (13) It can be expected that soon, resulting from the recommendations of this group of experts, projects and measures reducing the conflict between use and preservation of the collections will arise. The following examples are to show how difficult and complex the judgement of possible measures can be.

a) Union catalogues of historic collections by retrospective conversion of catalogues by automatic data processing

The building up of union catalogues of historic collections by retrospective conversion of catalogue records by means of automatic data processing are looked upon as most important measures. Although an improved and more comprehensive cataloguing will probably cause further possible dangers by increasing demands, the regional and supraregional recording of valuable older collections is necessary to plan adequate measures for protection. Even the registration of the originals can relieve interlending from the burden of numerous undirected orders and inform on what books should be particu-

larly protected because of their rarity.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, thanks to the initiative and financial support of the "Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft", a census of the imprints of the 15th century is prepared, the "Verzeichnis der Drucke des 16. Jahrhunderts aus dem deutschen Sprachbereich (VD16)" comprising about 40 volumes is in the process of being published, and the possibilities to establish a catalogue of the imprints of the 17th century are examined. Besides, the catalogues of the "Bayerische Staatsbibliothek" in Munich and of the "Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek" in Göttingen are to be converted into machine-readable form and to be published. Out of these catalogue-projects complete national recordings of the older collections could be cumulated through the participation of further libraries later on. (13) Some libraries with important collections comprising English language imprints contribute to the "Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalog (ESTC)" of the British Library and the Research Libraries Group.

The original concept of these catalogue-projects obviously emphasized purposes of bibliographic description, of contents classification and printing history, while preservation and conservation of the collections had not yet been recognized as problems so clearly. Otherwise, the cataloguing of the originals would probably have included the registration of the corresponding microfilms and microfiches (master- and working copies), paper copies, reprints, facsimile editions in library possession that could often be used instead of the original. This has not yet been achieved and must be seen as an important future task. All catalogues in machine-readable form can easily be enlarged with these materials, and this should be considered, because the joint listing of original and copies in one record can be used more comfortably than an additional inventory like the American "National Register of Microfiche Masters" published by the Library of Congress. (14)

Irrespectively, a central register of masterfiches is highly desirable, especially since it can probably be realized much sooner than the added entries in the big catalogues of older collections.

b) Restoration of the collections

While a generally accepted concept concerning the replacement of originals in German interlending by sending films or paper copies is missing up to now, the restoration of prescious collections, the preservation of important resources otherwise lost, has been highly advanced through a generous initiative of the "Stiftung Volkswagenwerk": Thanks to the support from the "Stiftung", restoration work shops in 14 research libraries (mostly university libraries) besides the well-known institutions in Göttingen, München and Wolfenbüttel, could be set up or extended since 1979/80, for instance (by regions): in Bremen, Hamburg, Hannover; Bielefeld, Düsseldorf, Münster; Darmstadt, Frankfurt; Heidelberg, Freiburg, Tübingen etc. Some of these work shops are equipped in a way allowing them to include other libraries of the region in their work. (15)

Whereas these work shops are particularly specialized in manuscripts and precious early prints, each library must care on its own for the preservation of more recent collections. (16) Up to now, enquiries about what part of their budget university libraries annually spend on repairing books and periodicals damaged by inderlending, frequent coying etc. do not exist. The official German library statistics show that 50 university libraries that spent about 134 Mio DM on acquisitions in 1983 had to use about 10% of that sum = about 13 Mio DM for binding expenses. It is however not recognizable how much of this sum was spent on repairing damages and how much this expense increased with the growing frequency

of use during the last years. (17)

c) Dispatch of microfiches or paper copies instead of the originals

To protect the originals and as preventive measure, Fabian suggests to fulfil each interlending order on books published before 1900 exclusively by sending microfiche copies: The library in possession of the original is to produce the master fiche and to send two Diazo copies of the master fiche to the receiving library, one for the reader, one for the library. Thus, by and by, decentralized collections of master fiches of all older books worthy of protection would be developed, that ought, however, be registered in a central record of all filmed media.

Fabian supports his suggestions with the positive experiences of several libraries concerning the filming of medieval manuscripts for protective or security reasons. (18) Besides, the important activities supported by the "Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft" of filming historically valuable newspapers in research libraries that has been carried through in agreement and cooperation with the "Mikrofilmarchiv der deutschsprachigen Presse e.V." must be mentioned. Today, the "Mikrofilmarchiv" can give information on 1.800 filmed newspapers of the German language in German libraries or archives, and provide the reader with the corresponding copies. (19)

The following advantages concerning the production of microfiches are mentioned among others:
- little space required, less storage problems,
- small postage fees in interlending,
- careful treatment of the originals by using adequate special cameras,

- a masterfiche can be copied as often as needed,
- microfiches are easier to handle than roll films. (20)

Whether these concepts can be realized does not only depend on the acceptance by users who often object to the inconvenient use of microfiches and insist on getting the single pages recopied on paper in the original size. The realization depends much more on the equipment of the libraries concerned with adequate microfiche cameras. But this has not yet been achieved. According to the information given in the official German library statistics, only 23, i.e. less than half, of 50 university libraries had a film- or photo department of their own. 30 libraries indicated that they could provide microforms, it is however probable that these are roll films and not fiches. Only 16 libraries possess the technical equipment to duplicate films, even less can duplicate microfiches. (21) Here, investments would be necessary which would surely prove profitable, but can't be paid for during the next years.

Referring to the remarkable disadvantages of microfiches (uncomfortable handling, various sizes, difficulties with the production of head-pieces, hardly useful and often defect readers, insecure durability etc.) and to several more or less unsuccessful attempts of commercial enterprises to start on large-scale microfiches projects concerning older literature, W. Schibel (22) suggests to produce resistent paper copies on nonacid paper and get them bound for patron's use instead of filming them. Copying on paper could be carried out by new copy printers that handle the book with care. Production and use of paper copies are not more expensive than fiches or film, the paper copy is even more durable and, if done properly, could be recopied. Thus, the character of the book would be preserved, and it would be usable more easily and universally.

4. Application of new technologies to solve the problems

It seems possible that the beginning discussion on the advantages or disadvantages of microfiches in comparison to paper copies will not be decided in the way that a national group of experts will develop a clear concept on the preservation of historic collections and will prefer one or the other technical device because of the analysis of costs and profits. Rather can be expected that the introduction and promotion of high density digital optical discs in near future, will play the decisive part in the preventive preservation and conservation of the rich historic book resources of German research libraries. The application of this modern device for information storage cannot be dealt with in detail in this context, particularly since twice during this conference, the various pilot projects of the Library of Congress will be sufficiently discussed. (23) But this advanced storage device will probably be able to solve the inevitable conflict between resource sharing and preservation, and intensify German interlending without further damage to the collections.

In future, possessing library and user will have the choice between 5 different procedures in interlending: in particular cases dispatch of the original, sending of a microcopy, dispatch of a conventionally produced paper copy, use of a high density digital optical disk locally or by teleprocessing, or - as in former times - the reader's journey to the book.

Thus, the universal availability of literature by means of interlending - the abuse of which used to interfere with this very availability - can be achieved on new ways. Beyond doubt, the proposals and activities of the new IFLA Core programme "Preservation and Conservation (PAC)" will also be stimulating on the national level. The solution of world-wide problems can best be tackled by international cooperation. (24)

N o t e s

1) Überregionale Literaturversorgung von Wissenschaft und Forschung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Denkschrift. Hrsg. vom Bibliotheksausschuß der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft. - Boppard 1975.

2) Bibliotheksplan 1973. Entwurf eines umfassenden Bibliotheksnetzes für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland. - Berlin 1973.

3) Die Ordnung des Leihverkehrs in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Text und Kommentar der Leihverkehrsordnung von 1979 mit erläuternden Beiträgen ... hrsg. von Bernhard Sinogowitz und Werner Kratsch. - Frankfurt a.M. 1982. (Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen u. Bibliographie: Sonderheft 35).

Sinogowitz, Bernhard: Leihverkehrs-Fibel. Kurzgefaßte Anleitung zur Praxis des Leihverkehrs der deutschen Bibliotheken ... - München 1980. (Bibliothekspraxis 24).

4) Deutsche Bibliotheksstatistik 1983. Teil B: Wissenschaftliche Bibliotheken. - Berlin 1984.

5) Fabian, Bernhard: Buch, Bibliothek und geisteswissenschaftliche Forschung. Zu Problemen der Literaturversorgung und der Literaturproduktion in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. - Göttingen 1983. (Schriftenreihe der Stiftung Volkswagenwerk 24).

6) Dittrich, Wolfgang: Erfahrungen und Probleme bei der Benutzung besonders schützenswerter Bestände. In: Wege zur neuen Bibliothek. 74. Deutscher Bibliothekartag 1984. - Frankfurt a.M. 1985, S. 155-169. (Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen u. Bibliographie: Sonderheft 41).

7) For the conflicts between use and preservation of collections, also in regard to interlending, refer to Dittrich loc.cit.

A comprehensive description of the problems with suggestions for solutions is offered in:

Kaltwasser, Franz G.: Document supply in the humanities. In: Large libraries and new technological developments ... Ed. by C. Redijk ... München 1984, S. 53-70. Daneben vgl.

Gleixner, Paul: Das alte Buch in der Benutzung. In: Bestände in wissenschaftlichen Bibliotheken ... 71. Deutscher Bibliothekartag 1981. - Frankfurt a.M. 1982, S. 78-85. (Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen u. Bibliographie: Sonderheft 34).

8) Zur Praxis des Handschriftenbibliothekars. Beiträge und Empfehlungen d. Kommission f. Handschriftenfragen. Hrsg. vom Deutschen Bibliotheksinstitut. - Frankfurt a.M. 1980. (Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen u. Bibliographie: Sonderheft 30).

9) Kratsch, Werner: Untersuchungen zur Struktur des Leihverkehrs der deutschen Bibliotheken. - Berlin 1983. (Dbi-Materialien 27).

10) Dachs, Karl: Bibliothekarische Probleme der Benutzung und Konservierung von Altbeständen. In: Gemeinsame Probleme von Staats- u. Hochschulbibliotheken in Großbritannien u. der Bundesrepublik Deutschland ... - Berlin 1981, S. 112-130 (Dbi-Materialien 10).

Dachs, Karl: Eine "Reserve seltener Drucke" für die Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. In: Bibliotheksforum Bayern 4, 1976, S. 175-190.

11) For the following refer to Fabian loc.cit., Kaltwasser loc. cit., important in this context also:

Empfehlungen zur Verwaltung alter und wertvoller Buchbestände und zur Organisation von Rara-Sammlungen. Hrsg. von der Kommission des Deutschen Bibliotheksinstituts für Handschriften und das alte Buch. In: Bibliotheksdienst 17, 1983, S. 496-507.

12) Reference is made to the discussion in the United Kingdom:

Ratcliffe, F.W.: Preservation policies and conservation in British Libraries: Report of the Cambridge University Library conservation project. - London 1984. (Library and information research reports 25).

13) Refer to Braun, Horst: Aus der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft. In: Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen u. Bibliographie 31, 1984, S. 179-181, 460-463 und 32, 1985, S. 192-194.

14) National Register of Microfiche Masters. A catalog of master microforms which have been produced for the sole purpose of preserving printed material on film. - Washington 1965 ff.

15) Köttelwesch, Clemens: Restaurierung wertvoller Altbestände in wissenschaftlichen Bibliotheken, ein Programm der Stiftung Volkswagenwerk. In: Etatkürzungen und Öffentlichkeitsarbeit ... 72. Deutscher Bibliothekartag 1982. - Frankfurt a.M. 1983, S. 39-47. (Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen u. Bibliographie: Sonderheft 38).

16) Activities in regard to deacidification of books and periodicals printed in the 19th and 20th centuries, as they are to be noted in the Library of Congress, are unknown in the Federal Republic of Germany until now. While thoughts and funds are spent in the United States of America on the possible advantages of international cooperation within the frame of IFLA's core programme "Preservation and conservation", in the Federal Republic of Germany not only consciousness but also sufficient funding is lacking for the support of such big-scale initiatives. - Refer to Welsh, William J.: Internationa

Cooperation in Preservation of Library Materials. International Conference on Research Library Cooperation, Stanford: Research Libraries Group, Inc. 1984, Paper No. 10.

17) Deutsche Bibliotheksstatistik 1983. Teil B: Wissenschaftliche Bibliotheken. - Berlin 1984. The percentage of expenditure in the 50 University Libraries cited varies from 6 to 20%. This variety cannot only be explained by specialized collections (Science, Medicine etc.) or by provenance of printed material.

18) Refer to notes 8 and 10.

19) Bohrmann, Hans: Zur Mikroverfilmung von Zeitungen. In: Der Archivar 37, 1984, S. 202-208. Das Verzeichnis der nachgewiesenen Mikrofilme soll 1986 im erweiterten Umfang erscheinen, zur Zeit gilt noch: Mikrofilm-Archiv der deutschsprachigen Presse. 6. Bestandsverzeichnis. Dortmund 1982.

20) Fabian loc.cit. S. 163-178.

21) Deutsche Bibliotheksstatistik 1983. Teil B: Wissenschaftliche Bibliotheken. - Berlin 1984. Tabelle 05.04: Kopierdienst.

22) Schibel, Wolfgang: Zur Erschließung und Bereitstellung älterer Bücher. In: Bibliotheksdienst 19, 1985, S. 368-382. Refer to his earlier paper containing remarkable suggestions:

Schibel, Wolfgang: Probleme der Erschließung und Bereitstellung alter Drucke. In: Etatkürzungen und Öffentlichkeitsarbeit ... 72. Deutscher Bibliothekartag 1982. - Frankfurt a.M. 1983, S. 69-79 (Zeitschrift für Bibliothekswesen und Bibliographie: Sonderheft 38).

23) Refer to Nr. 110 and 140 of the conference programme and to the paper: Price, Joseph: The Optical Disk Pilot Program at the Library of Congress. In: Videodisc and Optical Disc 4, 1984, S. 424-432.

24) Medium-Term Programme 1986-1991 compiled by the Professional Board of ILFA. - The Hague 1985, S. 17-19.

IFLA

1985

IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE, CHICAGO

Division: General Research Libraries

Section: Cataloguing. University and other General Research Libraries

UN-6
87 - CAT-2 - E

Authority Control - a Library Director's view

by

M RUNKLE

Director

University of Chicago Library

USA

KEYWORD(S):

For internal use only: Si

To be brought to meeting no:

170

Remarks:

to be presented orally ☒

for distribution only ☐

AUTHORITY CONTROL - A LIBRARY DIRECTOR'S VIEW

IFLA - August 1985

Martin Runkle, University of Chicago Library

The topic of my discussion paper is a library director's view of authority control. Besides being a director of a library, I am also a librarian and a user of libraries. Authority control affects my own work as I consult indexes, bibliographies, and library catalogs, and as I use library catalogs and other tools to find out where the materials are.

What is wanted of me today, however, is not the view of a user of libraries, but rather a library director's distinctive view of issues related to maintenance of authority control in library catalogs. I assume also that there is some expectation that my primary concern is cost and that I think the cost of authority control is too high. Though cost is, of course, always a major concern, cost must be considered in a context of values and priorities, or choices.

For the forseeable future, local library catalogs will be maintained as the primary tool for access to the collections held locally by libraries. Though the content and format of these catalogs will change, we will continue to have staff to create and maintain them in whatever medium, and they will continue to cost a lot of money. The library catalog is only one element in a vast array of elements in any library's system for providing access information. This array will grow and its elements will become more complex and more responsive as technology advances, but the local

catalog will remain for some time the basic tool for most of the daily use of our libraries.

Consistent entry forms and a system of cross-references have been the mechanical techniques traditionally used by librarians to create usable library catalogs. These same techniques are used in the multitudinous commercially produced bibliographic indexes of various sorts. Even with catalogs in machine-readable format, authority control continues to be a requirement. I don't know of any evidence that demonstrates that computer technology obviates the need for authority control. I don't know of any large library that has plans to abandon authority control in its catalog.

Because of the rapid movement toward on-line catalogs, and the resulting desire to convert our existing catalogs to machine readable form, we are having to address the high cost of implementation and maintenance of authority control in very large machine-readable bibliographic files.

The University of Chicago Library has a long tradition of using Library of Congress cataloging products. In 1910, the University brought J.C.M. Hanson, who had been the head of cataloging at the Library of Congress, to the University Library to be the Associate Director, and the Library has followed LC cataloging practices very closely since then. The result has been a very efficient cataloging operation. We plan to continue to follow LC practices very closely.

As libraries work toward total retrospective conversion of their catalogs, it seems obvious that a retrospective conversion of the catalog of the Library of Congress would be of enormous value--to the libraries of this nation and indeed to libraries all over the world.

The potential value to libraries in the United States seems clear. Headings established by the Library of Congress for catalog records have been for many years the base of the authority structure of the catalogs of research libraries in this country. The perception of the value of conforming to LC's heading forms does not seem to have changed in the transition from card catalogs to catalogs in machine-readable form. If LC's catalog were converted, its authority structure could serve as the base against which other retrospective conversion is performed. There is some evidence that, on the average, at least 75% of the titles represented in the catalogs of most libraries of the Association of Research Libraries are titles that have been cataloged by the Library of Congress. Conversion and distribution of LC's catalog records would provide source records of high quality and consistency for conversion of major portions of local catalogs.

I have been puzzled by the lack of interest among most research librarians in this country in conversion of the Library of Congress catalog, though I perceive several forces at work.

First, until very recently, the Library of Congress itself has not shown much interest. Until LC begins to feel the same imperatives that are driving other large libraries toward retrospective conversion, LC will not be motivated to think very hard about strategies.

Even if LC became convinced that conversion of its catalog would be a major benefit for its own purposes, as well as for the library community, an effort to move ahead might be constrained by the apparent indifference of the library community and even some negative attitudes toward the Library of Congress and its traditional

position of central importance--attitudes that have led to efforts by some to deemphasize the role of the Library of Congress in the national bibliographic system.

Because of the lack of interest in a retrospective conversion of the LC catalog, the research library community in the United States has not put any effort toward identifying strategies for such a project and determining some costs so that we'd be in a better position to evaluate feasibility and priorities. By so exclusively focusing our attention on the role of the bibliographic utilities and on our immediate concern for converting our local catalogs, we might, by our inattention, be weakening the base of support for LC's bibliographic services, which for so many years have been of such great benefit to research libraries. We should be working to keep these services in place, protect them, and build on them for the future. Who knows how technology will affect the long-term stability of the various other components of the bibliographic enterprise?

I have wondered if the indifference to a conversion of the Library of Congress catalog is in some cases an active fear of competition from other purveyors of bibliographic records. Laser disk technology will have a significant effect on computer technology as it applies to libraries. Vendors are now marketing relatively inexpensive laser disk readers along with subscriptions to regularly updated laser disks containing LC/MARC records. What would be the effect on the bibliographic utilities and various other dealers in catalog records if the entire LC catalog, regularly updated with current cataloging, were made available to libraries locally at a modest price? If there is a fear of the effects of such availability, I don't know how well-grounded the fear is.

I want to elaborate on my previous comments about negative attitudes toward the Library of Congress. I think that some librarians in this country resent the fact that Library of Congress cataloging is considered a standard that others should follow. Irked by the implication that cataloging done by other libraries is inferior to LC cataloging, they are inclined to want to diminish the role of LC. I recently came across a statement, in the form of a question, in a published paper that illustrates the attitude: "Is the concept of a centralized authenticating authority evidence of 'school-marmism', a phenomenon that has no place among libraries of equal stature and competence?"

It is unfortunate that references to LC cataloging so often include value-laden terms such as "quality" and "high standards." It is not so much the quality that we are after when we "follow LC," it is the consistency of entry headings and the system of authority records and cross-references that go along with them. The fact is that LC's catalog is the largest catalog and LC does more cataloging than any other single cataloging agency. Because entry headings have to be formulated not just according to certain rules, but in the context of headings that are already in a catalog, LC heading forms are generally most likely to be distinctive and are accepted as the standard. Not only is it efficient to follow LC, there is the added advantage that scholars benefit from the consistency across catalogs that is achieved by our following this standard.

We see a similar situation with the MARC formats; the existing formats are not necessarily the "best" possible formats for communicating bibliographic data, but we all benefit from the wide-spread acceptance of a standard. Indeed, one could make quite a game out of citing innumerable standards, debating their quality, and exploring their ramifications--for example, weights and measures, language, calendars,

and so on. My concern here is that sensitivity about using LC as a standard might be getting in the way of what is best for the library community.

In summary, I am a firm believer in the need to maintain a system of authority control in our machine-held catalogs pretty much as we have done for years in our card catalogs. I also believe that as we move toward total conversion of our existing catalogs to machine-readable form, the most economical way to implement authority control in those catalogs is to use the catalog of the Library of Congress as a base, and to this end, we should be focusing our efforts on achieving that conversion. The value to libraries in the United States would be incalculable. I would be interested in an assessment of the value to libraries in other countries of the world.

IFLA 1985

IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE, CHICAGO

Division: General Research Libraries

Section: University and other General Research Libraries

93-UN-7-E

Standards for University Libraries.

Draft prepared by the Section Working Party

edited by

Beverly P Lynch

University of Illinois at Chicago

USA

KEYWORD(S):

For internal use only:

To be brought to meeting no: 189

Remarks:

to be presented orally ☒

for distribution only ☐

International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions.
Section of University & other General Research Libraries.
Chairman, Anthony J. Loveday, MA.Dip Lib. ALA
SCONUL
102 Euston Street
London NW1 2HA
Tel. (441) 387-0317

Revised DRAFT June 1985

Working Group on University
Library Standards

Beverly P. Lynch, Ph.D.
University Librarian
University of Illinois at
Chicago
Box 8198
Chicago, Illinois 60680 USA
Tel. (312) 996-2716

Richard M. Dougherty, Ph.D.
Director
University Library
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Tel. (313) 764-9356

Prof. Dr. Hans-Albrecht Koch
Direktor der Staats-und
Universitatsbibliothek Bremen
Bibliotheksstrasse
D-2800 Bremen 33
Federal Republic of Germany
Tel. (0421) 2 18 26 01

This draft statement will be discussed on August 21, 1985, in an open meeting during the 1985 IFLA conference in Chicago.

STANDARDS FOR UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Introduction

This statement on Standards for University Libraries has been prepared by a working group of the Standing Committee of the Section on University Libraries and Other General Research Libraries. The first draft of the statement was reviewed by the Standing Committee at its meeting in Nairobi, August, 1984. At that meeting it was proposed that a revised draft be prepared, distributed, and discussed at the 1985 meeting in Chicago. The statement grew out of the 1981 IFLA meeting in Leipzig during which the Standing Committee presented a program on Standards for University Libraries. The program generated considerable interest in the development of an IFLA Statement on University Library Standards, particularly among librarians in third world countries. A recommendation from the UNESCO pre-session seminar sponsored by the Section in Munich in 1983 was forwarded to IFLA:

> "there is urgent need for the formulation of the basis for University Library Standards for application on a national and regional basis in developing countries and the Seminar urges the IFLA Section of University Libraries and other General Research Libraries...to undertake this work."

The Standing Committee agreed to do so.

An international statement on Standards for University Libraries, by its nature, must be general enough to allow for local, regional, and national variation. In some countries, university libraries have a responsibility to serve as national libraries. They play leading roles in national library development. An international statement of standards should not inhibit such responsibilities. These Standards for University Libraries are standards of general principles. They contain no prescriptions with regard to minimum numbers of hours, minimum ratio of librarians to support staff, minimum collection size or budget. Such prescriptions, if desirable, are to be established within a particular country or region. Attached to this statement are appendices containing model quantitative standards. These are appended in order to help librarians develop quantitative standards applicable to particular parts of the world. The appendices are guides only. They do not form a part of the standards.

International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. Section of University Libraries & other General Research Libraries. Standards for University Libraries. DRAFT June 1985

Purpose

The purpose of this Statement on University Library Standards is to provide a means by which the quality of the library serving a university can be assessed, to offer guidance for improvements in the library, and to suggest a framework within which various countries or regions could develop their own statements of standards. The quality of library service and collections in many countries depends to a great degree upon the capacity of the country to provide necessary resources. While a university library may have broader responsibilities, and may have constraints upon it that cannot be overcome, this statement places emphasis upon the library within the context of the university it serves.

Some librarians seek an international standard that would prescribe size of collection, size of staff, and size of budget. Others do not. This IFLA statement does not prescribe quantitative measures for adequate size. University libraries are encouraged to support national efforts at prescriptive standards and to develop various quantitative standards that reflect local, regional, or national variations.

Standards are used to evaluate the university library as a whole. They reflect interest in the quality of library services, collections, staff, and facilities as well as the size of the budget and other important functions in the library's operations. This statement reflects concern for the totality of the library's effort and the atmosphere in which that effort is carried out.

The Statement on Standards for University Libraries is written in the context of IFLA's dedication to the right of the university to fulfill purposes for which it was founded and to the rights of faculty and students to teach, learn, investigate, study and publish freely. It is within this context that the university's library is evaluated and for which guidance is offered.

STANDARD 1: Purpose

1.1. Each university library should define clearly its purpose and should incorporate this definition into a statement that reflects the purposes, goals, and objectives of the institution of which it is a part.

1.2. The formulation of the statement of purpose is a major decision; basic changes should be made only after proper consideration and approval by the university's officers and/or governing board.

1.3. In the context of the stated purposes of the university, the library should have adequate and appropriate staff, financial resources, physical facilities, collections and services to meet the stated purposes, goals, and objectives of the institution.

STANDARD 2: Organization and Administration

2.1. The administrative organization of the library should bring together its various resources and coordinate them effectively to accomplish its objectives.

2.2. The organization and structure of the library, as well as its administrative processes, should be well defined and understood.

2.3. The place of the library within the administration and governance structure of the university should be defined clearly, and the responsibilities and authority of the library administration and its chief administrative officer should be defined.

2.4. The library's major policies and procedures should be defined, recorded in written form, made readily available, and reviewed regularly.

2.5. A library committee consisting of representatives of the faculties, the university's administration, the chief administrative officer of the library should advise on matters pertaining to the budget and policies for collection development and use.

STANDARD 3: Services

3.1. The services provided by the library should be related clearly to the purposes of the university.

3.2. The library's services should be designed to promote and facilitate effective use of recorded information in all formats by all of the library's clientele.

3.3. Services offered by the library should include reference and information services, which are available at adequately identified and designated points during established service hours, and specialized and in-depth assistance to individuals in the use of the library's resources.

3.4. The library should maintain and make available for use records of its collections which are complete, consistent, and in conformity with recognized standards of cataloging and classification.

3.5. Most items in the library's collection should be readily available for consultation in the library and, within the context of the library's purpose, goals, and objectives, should be available to authorized clientele.

3.6. Terms of loan and access to the library's collections should be described for all user categories. Circulation procedures should be effective and efficient.

STANDARD 4: Collections

4.1. The library's collection should be of sufficient size and scope to support the university's total instructional needs and to facilitate the university's research programs.

4.2. The library's collection should include required and assigned readings, reference and bibliographic materials, basic journals and serials, as well as any other library materials students are expected to consult regularly in the course of their studies or in the preparation of their theses or dissertations.

4.3. The library should define the policies for collection development that will guide the selection and acquisition of materials. Such policies shall be developed by the librarians in consultation with the university's faculty and administration.

4.4. The library's collection should contain all of the varied forms of recorded information.

4.5. The library's collection should be reviewed systematically to ensure its relevance to the university's needs. Obsolete, out-of-date materials should be removed from the collection.

4.6. The library should participate in the development and implementation of various methods of interlibrary cooperation to ensure the supplementing of local resources and the availability of library materials.

STANDARD 5: Staff

5.1. The library should have a sufficient number and variety of personnel to develop, organize and maintain the collections and provide information and reference service necessary to meet university needs. The size and qualifications of staff will be determined by many factors including size and scope of collections, number of separate library units, number of service points, number of service hours, rate of acquisition, rate of circulation, nature of processing, nature of service demand.

5.2. Librarians perform the core academic and professional functions of the library: collection development, reference and information service, and substantive activities related to bibliographic control of materials. They should have the appropriate academic and professional education and experience including, when necessary, graduate or professional degrees in their particular specialties.

5.3. Ratio of librarians to clerical and other staff will vary depending upon the range of operations and services provided by the library and to its total workload requirements.

5.4. Terms and conditions of employment of librarians should be consonant with established terms and conditions of employment of faculty elsewhere within the university. Terms and conditions of employment of the library's clerical and other staff should parallel those of similar employees within the university as a whole.

5.5. Libraries should develop programs to encourage and assist all members of the staff in their professional growth and development.

5.6. The performance of the staff determines in large part the quality of the library's collections and services. Within the context of the university's policies and procedures, the library should provide for continuing evaluation of job performance and for equitable recognition of staff effectiveness.

STANDARD 6: Facilities

6.1. The buildings housing the university's libraries should be of sufficient size and quality to house the collection and to provide sufficient space for their use by students, faculty, and staff.

6.2. The facilities should be attractive and designed to promote operational efficiencies and effectiveness of use. Specific factors include light, ventilation, temperature and humidity control, layout of stacks, number of reader stations.

6.3. Suitable space for staff must be available.

6.4. Within the context of the university's educational purposes, the library should be well-equipped to encourage maximum use by the university's students, faculty, and staff.

STANDARD 7: Budget and Finance

7.1. The adequacy of the financial resources of the library is to be judged in relation to the basic purpose of the university, the scope of the university's academic program, and the number of its students. The library must be provided with sufficient funding to enable it to develop appropriate collections, recruit and retain suitable staff, provide appropriate services, accomplish necessary operations, and satisfy user needs.

7.2. The library's budget shall be a distinct part of the university's budget. The budget is a statement of estimated income and expenditures for a fixed period of time, usually the fiscal year of the institution.

7.3. The library's budget shall be developed and managed by the chief administrative officer of the library.

STANDARD 8: Cooperation

8.1. Consistent with its statement of purpose, the University Library should engage with other libraries in cooperative activities relating to collection development, resource sharing, the development of union catalogs, the preservation and conservation of library materials.

8.2. The University Library should make use of all available technology including electronic data processing and telecommunication systems.

#5510A(1b)

IFLA

1985

IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE, CHICAGO

Division: General Research Libraries

Section: University and other General Research Libraries

16-UN-1-E

Co-operation in Mexican University Libraries

by

R GARDUNO

Researcher in Library Sciences

UNAM/CUIB

Mexico

KEYWORD(S):

Cooperation
Mexican University Libraries

For internal use only: Si

To be brought to meeting no:

136

Remarks:

to be presented orally ☒

for distribution only ☐

COOPERATION IN MEXICAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

ABSTRACT

The paper is divided into three basic parts: the background of cooperation in Mexican university libraries, the present situation and a proposal for future cooperation.

Regarding the first point, a general setting is presented concerning outstanding historical aspects concerned with cooperation between the type of libraries mentioned. The historical data contained in this point covers the period from 1977 to 1980.

Concerning the second point, general data is included on the following aspects: shared acquisition of bibliographic materials, cooperative cataloguing, interlibrary loan, and union catalogs.

Under the third point, in the manner of conclusions, proposals are presented for the future to coordinate cooperation between Mexican university libraries, based on current library programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF COOPERATION IN MEXICAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

The topic of cooperation in Mexican libraries has been amply discussed. The ABIESI (Association of Librarians of Institutions of Higher Education and Research) (among which are included those of universities) organized in 1977 the Seminar on Cooperation in Libraries and Information Centers with the objetct of comprehending the realities of cooperation and getting abreast of projects of that period.

In the ABIESI seminar it was emphasized that:

"The constant price increase of bibliographical materials, the rise in costs of professional personnel, the scarcity of librarians and budgetary restrixtions are only a few of the factors that force us to look for alternative solutions to confront problems caused by the rapid growth of information produced throughout the world.(1)

During the Seminar, projects were presented under the following categories:

Cooperative acquisitions, Cooperative cataloging, Union catalogs and Interlibrary loan.

Cooperative acquisitions

The projects included under this heading are based on the necessity of cooperation in the area of cooperative

---

(1) QUIJANO SOLIS, ALVARO. Palabras del presidente de la ABIESI. (En: Seminario de cooperación en Bibliotecas y Centros de Documentación, del 14 al 16 de septiembre de 1977) p XXXIX

acquisitions. Their scope extends from local to regional projects. Comments generally cover the fundamentals of how to put these programs into effect. In several of them emphasis was placed on the use of automation.

Cooperative cataloging

The project presented stress the advantages that may by obtained from cooperative cataloging. It was likewise emphasized that centralized cataloging had the aim of obtaining improved results. It was also brought out that the creation of a system of shared resources in cataloging at local, regional and national levels was fundamentally for the attainment of cooperative cataloging. As for the use of foreing data bases (for example OCLC), the conclusion was that neither the costs nor the reply time, justified the use of the system at that time. Taking into account the project called Nucleus Network, one of the most ambitious, it was hoped that the establishment of an infrastructure for the creation of a cataloging center would facilitate the technical processing in different libraries.

Union catalogs

The projects presented in this area underlined the advantages of generating union catalogs of monographic materials and periodicals in different disciplines. It was emphasized that cooperation in the matter of union catalogs required clase ties among libraries including their participation in the numerous tasks required in the creation of catalogs.

Interlibrary loan

The papers presented described the benefits of interlibrary loan and punctuated the need of creating an awareness favorable to increased loans betwen libraries at lo

cal, regional and national levels.
There is not the slightest doubt that results of the Seminar were highly satisfactory, due to the insights gained into cooperative programs at the national level and the opportinity of exchanging ideas with other colleagues, wich created a consensus in support of the projects presented and in generating new cooperative planning. In spite of the food intentions of the seminar, the great majority of the proyects presented were abandoned for a variety of reasons.

Quite clearly, it may be observed fron the papers presented, the lack of planned cooperation. Most of the proyects were result of isolated efforts, with the intention of obtaining results in the same institution which had created the plan and only as a side effect to serve as a support for interlibrary cooperation. Fron this generalization, we sould exclude the few projects that covered aspects of cooperation at the regional level or by group of libraries.

Of the projects presented during the ABIESI Seminar, only a few have been continued, such a: Cooperative acquisition of periodicals in the biomedical area, Automated cataloging shared by the states of San Luis Potosí, Aguascalientes and Guanajuato, the Union catalog of periodicals of the Monterrey and Saltillo libraries and the Union catalog of periodicals in libraries of the Mexican Republic. It should be made clear that this last project was detained for several years and approximately a year ago it was reiniated.

It should also be mentioned that during 1983 and 1984 a group of instituions of higher education formed a professional group which initiated the cooperative projects called CORPES. This plan had as its chief objetive the

creation of technical and legal guidelines for the development of programs in interlibrary cooperation. The group favored research into projects considered of prime importance such as: Catalogs of monographic publications, catalogs of periodicals and serials, design and implementation of a postgraduate program in librarianship, support of library automation and inventories of resources and services of libraries of public and private institutions of higher education. However, this project has been suspended.

II. COOPERATION TODAY

At present, the programs and projects of interlibrary cooperation where it was possible to obtain information and which are active include: Those undertaken by CONACYT (National Council of Science and Technology). This Council has as function the creation of guidelines for Mexican libraries, and for this reason, the proyects or programs of cooperation covered, are of fundamental importance due to its decisive role in all areas of cooperation which are realized in Mexico. The projects at the present time in which CONACYT is involved are:

1. Union catalog of periodicals in libraries of the Mexican Republic.

This catalog was initiated several years ago, suspended for a number of years and at the present time has been renewed. It is conceived as an automated system which centralizes bibliographical information regarding periodicals held by university libraries in the Mexican Republic.

2. National data bases.

CONACYT has formed several specialized groups in librarianship and automation with the objetct of establishing

the technical foundations for the generation of national data bases as well as the commercialization of local data bases. The specialized commissions have as chief function: the determination of cataloging norms, rules for handling free and controlled language, use of formats for storing information, software analysis, hardware analysis, and offering guidance to institutions interested in the creation of data bases.

It is also important to mention the cooperative efforts in different areas of knowledge which are sponsored by educational institutions that for their importance and size are representative in Mexico:

Universities of Central Mexico

For some times the Universities of Aguscalientes, Guanajuato and San Luis Potosí have undertaken a cooperative program in joint acquisitions and technical services. It should be mentioned that this joint program has been carried out very consistently and with continuity.

ARUTSI (Regional Association of Universities for the Development of Library Systems)

The network of libraries called ARUTSI has as principal objetive the promotion and optimization in the use of documentary resources in libraries located in northwestern Mexico. At this time approximately 43 university libraries belong. Participation of member libraries is formalized by means of agreements devised in legal terms with the object of assuring membership cooperation. One of the principal programs is the Union catalog of periodicals of the libraries of the northwestern part of the contry.

ANUIES (National Association of Universities and Institutions of Higher Education)

This program primarily serves in the grouping of 110 university libraries interested in higher education. One of its principal efforts has been the development of a catalog of educational periodicals.

AMBAGRO (National Association of Agricultural Librarians)

The group which makes up this Association has constantly encouraged cooperation among the member libraries. At the present time, ten libraries participate and as a result of their cooperation, they now have a catalog of Mexican periodical in the biomedical area. At the same time they are developing bibliographies of monographic materials and serials in areas related to the agricultural sciences.

Energéticos

The cooperative program in energy resources consists in the development of a joint periodical acquisitions program in this area. This program is strongly supported by the Institute of Electrical Research, the Mexican Petroleum Institute and the National Institute of Nuclear Research. This program, althrough not related to any Mexican university may be considered pertinent for inclusion due to the effect of the results obtained for Mexican university libraries in the area of cooperation.

National System of Biomedical Information

Varios efforts have been made in this area such as the formation of the BIBAC association of librarians (Biomedical Librarians, A.C.), the compilation of a biomedical library dictectory, the creation of a technical

base for the development of a union catalog of periodicals in this area, and the initiation of legal agreements for interlibrary cooperation among all biomedical libraries of the country.

REBIMEX (National Network of State University Libraries)

The activities of this program are coordinated by the National Library of Mexico and it pursues as objective: the integration of a state university library network with the aim of determining strategies that will permit cooperation and delimit priorities based on such cooperation. With this in mind, regular meetings are held among the members of the network and aspects regarding union catalogs, cooperative acquisitions, cooperative cataloging and interlibrary loan, have been discussed.

It is important to point out that not all of the programs mentioned are carried out through agreements. The majority of them are governed by voluntary cooperative support, an aspect that in many accasions can be harmful because the cooperating institutions do not feel pressured by a legal convention, wich can vitiate the continuity of the joint program. On the other hand, the National System of Biomedical Information as well as the REBIMEX project, discussed above, are supported by the National University of Mexico (UNAM). Mereover, this university has in operation a number of automated systems which can be used in a systematic way and with national coverage in the area of interlibrary cooperation since these systems count upon an administrative and technological structure that guarantees consistent cooperation and on a solid foundation. The systems referrad to are:

LIBRUNAM

LIBRUNAM is a system of a system of bibliographical information for books, integrated by means of modules for

on-line information retrieval. It is based on routines that among other things permit rapid acquisition and technical processing of books and the possibility of duplicating and elaborating sets of catalog cards in accord with the Anglo-American cataloging rules. At the present time, there are approximately 300,000 titles retrievable on-line.

Since the LIBRUNAM data base not only permits bibliographical consultation, bul also aids in the technical processing of library materials, this automated system can help other university libraries in Mexico and in other Latin American countries by means of a cooperative system aimed at the classification of bibliographical resources and interlibrary loan services.

In the Mexican and Latin American context, the LIBRUNAM data base represents a wide source of information, since among the 300,000 titles stored, the holdings of university libraries of the country generally are to be found, according to samplings carried out with the Universities of San Luis Potosí and Sonora, in Mexico, with universities of Colombia through ICFES (Colombia Institute for the Development of Higher Education) and with the Catholic University of Chile. (2)

The LIBRUNAM system was developed by the UNAM's General Departmen of Libraries. This Department is responsable

---

(2) GARDUÑO VERA, ROBERTO. The Application of the Automation to the Library Processes of the National Automous University of Mexico. p. 8. (En: International Federation of Library Association, Mauch, West Germany, 1983.)

for the cordination of 170 departamental libraries which make up the library system of the university. It counts on a solid administrative infrastructure and at present is carrying out studies for incorporating new techniques of information storage and retrieval that will guarantee a greater utilization of the LIBRUNAM system. For this reason, we must insist that this system should be utilized for interlibrary cooperation with national coverage.

Automated Information System UNAM-JURE

The UNAM-JURE Information System is conceived as an on-line informational retrieval system for Mexican legislation. Its principal objective consists in supporting research and teaching on Mexican legislation realized at the National University. the system was evolved by the Institute of Judicial Research at the National University of Mexico in collaboration with the Institute de Recherches et d'Estudes pour Traerament de l'Information Juridique (IRETIJ) of Montpellier, France. This system could serve as the basis for cooperation at the national level among special law libraries.

Automated System of the Center for Scientific and Humanistic Information (CICH)

The CICH information system has been planned as an information storage system for the control principally in the processing of 10,000 serial titles for the 170 departmental libraries which make up the National University library system. It also elaborates routines for the storage and editing of publications.

This automated system could be channelled toward the structuring of a union catalog of periodicals which the UNAM receives and in this way establish norms for the generation of like programs.

On the other hand, CONACYT (National Council of Science and Technology) permits Mexican libraries, through the SECOBI node (Data Base Consultant Service), connections with 400 foreing data bases via teleprocessing. The systems that can be utilized through this node are: ORBIT, Dialog, New York Times, Data Resources, Bibliographical Retrieval Services, G'CAM, Sligos and CISI. In order to be able to use these systems on-line, SECOBI has connected at the present time, 170 terminals, which, thinking in terms of their widen use, could support some national cooperation program if, for example, the LIBRUNAM data base or the UNAM-JURE system were available through this node.

III. CONCLUSIONS

With this panorama presented here, it can be affirmed that there is a consciousness on the part of Mexican librarians regarding the benefits that interlibrary cooperation can bring about.

In the present Mexican economic context, the constant price increase of library materials, the rise in professional salaries, the scarcity of librarians and budgetary restrictions are some of the factors which determine the necessity for Mexican university libraries for developing planned and continued cooperation with the end in mind of surmounting the scarcities mentioned above and attaining library service objectives. Mexican librarians have made efforts in creating an atnosphere appropiate for propitiating joint activities among Mexican libraries. All this effort has resulted in the creation or continuation of groups that have pushed interlibrary cooperation to new levels. However, one can not say that there exists today a structural congruence with continuity regarding cooperation apart from a few axceptions.

The experience of Mexican libraries in the area of interlibrary cooperation shows that when such activities are placed in a context of local, regional or national cooperation and integration, the benefits have been felt only by those institutions or groups where there existed or was created first an infrastructure and where it was possible to articulate a means of action. Besides, it was understood that the task of obtaining, processing and diffusing information is an activity that involves complex financial, organizational and technical factors that require maximum rationalization in order to avoid unnecessary duplication which cause among other effects: high costs, inefficient utilization of resources and slow and unproductive processes.

Cooperation is the lesson that has been learned by organizers and diffusers of information due to the increase in the production of information, confronted with the necessity of lowering costs and distributing work loads in search of better standards of production. it has been understood that if there is a desire to satisfy user information needs, there must be an interchange of processes, products and services, removed from any situation that impedes the division of labor, the unencumbered circulation of information and the transfer of cooperative experiences.

However, it should be kept in mind that cooperation is also subject to political, technical and organizational factors and to human resources. Also, not less important, are professional jealousies and institutional selfishness which impede common joint action. As long as librarians are not capable of creating an ethic and philosophy of cooperation , all joint effort will be partial and unrpoductive, and thus any program will be sterile.

We Mexican librarians have as our responsability the attainment of a joint cooperative program for more than 1500 university libraries distributed in 31 states. If it is true that cooperation has been fostered in recent years, it is also true that type of cooperation that is required today goes much farther than the simple interchange of publications. Cooperation should be practiced in each one of the different steps in the documentary chain. In this way, it would be possible to speak of integral cooperation so necessary in Mexican universitu libraries.

BIBLIOGRAFIA

ABIESI. Seminario de Cooperación en Bibliotecas y Centros de Información. Saltillo, Coah. México, 1968. 300p.

AMBAC (Asociación Mexicana de Bibliotecarios). XVI Jornadas Mexicanas de Biblioteconomía 2 al 6 de mayo de 1983. Zacatecas, Zac. México, 1983. 424p.

ARIAS ORDOÑEZ, JOSE. Bases para un trabajo cooperativo entre bibliotecas universitarias Latinoamericanas. (En: Universitas Humanística, año XIII,No. 21, enero-junio, 1984.) pp. 31-61.

BRONSOILER FRID, CHARLOTTE. LIBRUNAM: Sistema automatizado para Bibliotecas, por Charlotte Bronsoiler Frid, Israel Steinberg, Alfredo Bronsoiler Frid, (et. al.). México, UNAM, Dirección General de Bibliotecas, 1982. 120 p. ilus.

CORPES. Informe del grupo técnico por el área de bibliotecas. (documento mecanografiado)

Hacia un Sistema Nacional de Información y Documentación en Salud. (En: Boletín informativo BIBAC, No. 5, marzo 1984)

MORALES CAMPOS, ESTELA. La automatización como apoyo a la cooperación. (En: III Coloquio Sobre Uso y Manejo de la Información, del 8 al 11 de octubre de 1984). 16 p.

MORALES CAMPOS, ESTELA. Estudio de factibilidad para la asesoría México-Colombia. México, UNAM, Dirección General de Bibliotecas 1981. 80 p.